

Remarks on the name *Sarracenia laciniata* Kerner

HAROLD N. MOLDENKE

The name *Sarracenia laciniata* apparently occurs for the first time in botanical literature in A. J. Kerner von Marilau's "Pflanzenleben," edition 1, volume 1, published in 1887. It is not accompanied by any diagnosis or description and occurs only in the legend (figure 3) under the illustration of several insectivorous plants which is found on page 118. It is apparently mentioned nowhere else in the text and is therefore a splendid example of what is known technically as a hyponym. Although effectively published (perhaps unintentionally) by Kerner at this point, its publication cannot be considered valid according to the international rules of nomenclature as adopted by the great majority of the botanists of the world today. Kerner's book is a splendid textbook and has always been widely used in German-speaking countries. His figure, therefore, has certainly been seen by many hundreds of botanical students and professors, and, indeed, has been widely copied by authors of other texts.

The next mention of the name is in the second edition of Kerner's text, published in 1890. This was followed, in 1894, by an English translation by F. W. Oliver, entitled "The Natural History of Plants," where, on page 127 of the first volume, Kerner's illustration is copied and where his name, *Sarracenia laciniata*, occurs again under figure 3. In the same year (1894) P. Constantin published his "Le Monde des Plantes" (as a part of A. E. Brehm's "Marveilles de la Nature" series), and here Kerner's illustration is again copied and his hyponymous name is again used (volume 1, page 97, figure 145).

In 1903 A. Hansgirg employed the same illustration and name in his "Phyllobiologie" (page 228), and in 1911 L. H. Pammel made use of both in his "A Manual of Poisonous Plants" (page 498). This was followed, in 1913, by the third edition of Kerner's "Pflanzenleben," where the same illustration is used and the name is repeated without correction (volume 1, page 311).

Three editions have thus far been published of R. M. Holman and W. W. Robbins' very popular work entitled "A Text-

book of General Botany" and in each one Kerner's illustration is again reproduced, with the name *Sarracenia laciniata* in the explanation beneath it (ed. 1, p. 206. 1924; ed. 2, p. 231, fig. 168. 1927; ed. 3, p. 223, fig. 171. 1934). O. Stapf, in his "Index Londinensis" (volume 6, page 7. 1931) records the name and cites six of the references just enumerated.

In spite of its occurrence, thus, in eleven books, several of which are, or have been, among the most popular and widely used textbooks of general botany, the name *Sarracenia laciniata* has never been recorded in the "Index Kewensis" or in any of its eight supplements issued to date, nor does it occur in J. A. Clark's "Card Index of Genera, Species, and Varieties of Plants Published since 1885," although the genus is strictly American. These omissions are most remarkable because surely hundreds of botanical students, professors, and research workers must have seen the name in one or more of the references cited above. The name is used, as we have seen, in botanical textbooks written in German, English, and French, and not one of the books cited is an obscure publication. Its omission cannot be due to its being a mere hyponym, because hundreds of hyponyms are recorded in these two invaluable indices, as, for instance, the many names published by N. Wallich in his "A Numerical List" (1829-1832) and by Glaziou in *Mémoires* 3 of the "Bulletin de la Société Botanique de France," volume 58, pages 1-661 (1911-1912). Its omission can apparently only be accounted for by the assumption that no one of the hundreds who saw the name in print in their textbooks ever took the time or trouble to hunt it up in these indices to find out more concerning the plant to which it was applied, or, if they did and found that it was not therein included, no one ever took the trouble to write to the editors of these indices concerning it, because if they had it would surely have been subsequently included, since the editors of these works are always very glad to have omissions called to their attention. This obvious lack of interest on the part of the users of these textbooks (including teachers as well as students) does not speak very highly of their initiative, scientific curiosity, or desire for accuracy.

What is still more amazing, however, is that the name appears nowhere in J. M. Macfarlane's supposedly complete monograph of the *Sarraceniaceae* in volume 4 of A. Engler's

"Das Pflanzenreich" (no. 110. 1908)! In the opinion of the present writer a monograph of any genus or family of plants should dispose of *all* names ever proposed within that group, whether these names were validly published or not. Hyponyms, *nomina nuda*, and cheironyms (herbarium names) are continuously encountered by systematists in their daily work, and while none of these names have any botanical standing, yet there is never one of them encountered without a question arising in the mind of the systematist who has found it, as to just what the correct name is for the plant to which this untenable name was applied. It should be one of the purposes of a scientific monograph to bring all such names together, as well as all validly published names now relegated to synonymy, and to dispose of each one under its appropriate species. When a systematist refers to a recently published scientific monograph of a genus or family he has the right to expect to find therein *all* names ever proposed in that group up to the date of publication of the monograph. It is to be hoped that the next treatment of the *Sarraceniaceae* for "Das Pflanzenreich" will be more complete in this respect, and therefore more useful than the last edition.

Another most remarkable fact in this connection is that in all three editions of Holman & Robbins' textbook the illustration of the so-called *Sarracenia laciniata* is lettered "B," while in each case the legend beneath the figure refers the name *Sarracenia laciniata* to "C." This brings about a most deplorable confusion, because figure "C" represents the California pitcher-plant (*Chrysamphora californica*), there incorrectly called *Darlingtonia californica* and referred to "B." One would suppose that at least one of the many users of these texts would have noticed this error and would have taken the trouble to write to the authors concerning it, so that it could be rectified in the next edition. Likewise in all three editions the name *Sarracenia variolaris* is used for figure "A," when it has long ago been shown that this name is not tenable and all contemporary workers use the older name, *S. minor*. It would be a good plan, indeed, in the opinion of the present writer, if the authors of textbooks which are not works on taxonomy, would submit their manuscript to a taxonomist before publication, so that he could bring their scientific names up to date!

Finally, for the benefit of those interested in pitcherplants,

it should be said that the plant illustrated by Kerner and to which he applied the hyponym, *Sarracenia laciniata*, is apparently the well-known *S. Drummondii* Croom of the southeastern states, ranging from northwestern Florida to Mississippi and western Georgia and known locally as "purple-trumpet" or "fiddler's-trumpet." The name *S. laciniata* should, therefore, henceforth be relegated to synonymy under *S. Drummondii*.

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN